

**AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Approved

For meeting of August 19, 2004

**MEMBERS
PRESENT**

Alan Fox
Douglas Haubert
Bob Luskin
Carol Soccio
Don Temple
Deborah Veady
Bernhard Clever

**MEMBERS
ABSENT**

Ron Salk
Bruce Alton

**STAFF
PRESENT**

Chris Kunze
Dottie Jones
Sharon Diggs-Jackson
Dennis Rambeau
Sileneka Smith
Jerry Caliguiri

**OTHERS
PRESENT**

Sign-in sheet attached or
available on request

Call to Order

Chair Alan Fox called the Airport Advisory Commission to order at 4:10 p.m., at the Long Beach Energy Department.

Roll Call

Mr. Chris Kunze, Airport Manager, called roll and certified that a quorum was present. Chairman Fox noted that it is the first meeting that Vice-Chair Ron Salk has missed in the four years of his service to the Airport Advisory Commission. Chairman Fox stated that a vote of gratitude is deserved by Ron Salk for an excellent job as Chairman of the Commission over the past two years, and congratulates him.

Approval of Minutes

The Airport Advisory Commission minutes of the meeting of July 15, 2004 were approved as submitted.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted. Chairman Fox asked to take Item #2 of New Business out of order, 2004-2005 City Council Liaisons and Committee Assignments. He asked Commissioner Soccio to be coordinator for the Commission in terms of the assignments, and asked each Commissioner to report to her their preferences. Commissioner Soccio will report back at the September meeting with the formal assignments.

Chairman Fox stated that regarding the current subcommittee assignments, it would be appropriate to readdress the assignments for the new fiscal year, and asked the Commissioners to contact him with their preferences.

Airport Bureau Staff Report

- Chris Kunze introduced Dennis Rambeau, Airport Operations Specialist, who gave the noise report and operations statistics. He stated that many of the complaints were due to the construction related runway closure. He stated that 19 complaints were related to operations that were in violation of the City's Noise Compatibility Ordinance. Commissioner Soccio asked how the 19 Noise Ordinance violations were being handled. Mr. Rambeau stated that all 19 have been sent violation notices with appropriate fines, with some being in the alternative enforcement category.

- Ms. Diggs-Jackson handed out a City Council letter slated for the agenda of August 24th, entitled “Resolution and award to authorize a maintenance agreement contract with Lochard”, the provider and server of the ANOMS systems. The existing contract expires in September.
- Mr. Kunze noted that the requested load factor report shows no significant changes from the previous month except that JetBlue Airways had a 91% load factor for July. Mr. Kunze mentioned the Runway 30 project, stating that Commissioners are welcome to tour the site any evening and to contact staff for arrangement of a tour. He stated that the project is on schedule for completion in December. Mr. Kunze stated that AOPA Expo is being planned for October 21,22,23,24, and that there will be an in-depth briefing at the September Commission meeting. Ms. Diggs-Jackson stated that as part of outreach efforts, Public Affairs has added two staff members versed in working with the community, Zelma Hawkins, and Jerry Caliguiri.

New Business

LGB Aviation Noise Abatement Committee Update

Mr. Curt Castagna stated that the Long Beach Airport Aviation Noise Abatement Committee (ANAC) is a product of 1995 airport noise litigation settlement where operators and users of the Airport work together with staff to mitigate the impacts of aircraft noise. He stated that there are three items for review. He addressed the dialogue given to the Commission regarding the Terminal improvements and Airport operations, stating that one consistent theme is that community members did not know there was an airport in the area. He stated that ANAC is working on an outreach effort to try to eliminate that perception and educate both residents and businesses relocating to Long Beach. Mr. Castagna referred to a brochure containing a fact sheet available to residents, community groups, and new businesses. Mr. Castagna stated, regarding the noise complaints reported by Airport staff, that ANAC in conjunction with staff met with helicopter businesses at Long Beach and others that are not based at Long Beach, in an effort to educate them to the proper arrival and departure routes to the field. A letter of agreement was established between those businesses and the Air Traffic Control Tower on how they will operate, altitude, and other means to “fly quietly and fly friendly”. Mr. Castagna stated that the ANAC is concerned about the Douglas Park development and read a letter on the position of ANAC.

Commissioner Temple asked for Mr. Castagna’s recommendation. Mr. Castagna stated that the ANAC specifically did not take a position because the committee is designed to mitigate noise concerns, and stated that with regard to any development on the site, overflights must be taken into consideration. Mr. Castagna also noted that a “fly quietly” poster has been distributed to all flight schools and FBO operators, to encourage student pilots and other operators to fly quietly and to understand the noise rules and hours of operations.

Old Business

Status Report on Terminal Improvements Alternatives

Chairman Fox noted that the Commission has been reviewing proposed improvements to the Airport Terminal and at the July 15th meeting it was requested of staff to propose scaled down alternatives. He then asked Mr. Kunze to report on those alternatives.

Mr. Kunze stated that staff would like to give the Commission a sense of the direction they were taking in order to ensure that the analysis presented at the September meeting was what the Commission wanted addressed. Mr. Kunze introduced Joe Grogan, Principal Planner for HNTB, to review and answer questions regarding the functional areas of the terminal and the downsizing options being analyzed by HNTB.

Mr. Grogan provided a handout containing a narrative and a table. He stated that HNTB will be looking at two scenarios, one being the “worst-case” reduction, and one being the middle of the road reduction. Scenario one is the middle of the road reduction and scenario two is the “worst case”. Mr. Grogan stated that HNTB and City staff originally recommended a program that they believe meets the requirements of the Airport, built on minimum standards across the country. He stated that the additional options being analyzed go below those minimum standards. Mr. Kunze reminded everyone that the recommended project scope is only for the purposes of doing the EIR. Mr. Grogan stated that the proposed project is based on the scenario one, 4.2 million passenger forecast, and that the EIR will look at scenario two, 5.0 million passenger forecast, as well. Mr. Grogan discussed each component on the table, discussing where there will be reductions in the alternatives to be presented.

Commissioner Soccio asked if the “existing” figures in the table include the temporary structures. Mr. Grogan stated that temporary structures are included, and that the current square footage per peak hour originating passenger is known, and carrying that same ratio into the future, one could forecast facility needs based on 4.2 million arriving/departing passengers.

Chairman Fox stated that the requirements of TSA have been unfulfilled, and that their first presentation was vague. He asked if mandatory spacing requirements were discussed with TSA. Mr. Kunze stated that TSA did not provide staff with any mandatory requirements, however, there are some standard metrics that staff used as the basis for their square footage.

Commissioner Soccio asked for clarification regarding there being no seating in the concession area, and that passengers would buy an item and take it to the holdroom because there would be no seating space at the concessions. Mr. Grogan stated that that is correct, and that passengers would take their food where they could sit, or take in on the aircraft. Commissioner Soccio stated that that would not necessarily reduce revenue, as people would still buy items and take them to another site. Mr. Grogan stated that there would be some reduction because people with time available prior to boarding their aircraft want to sit, and would not buy as much knowing they have to carry it on the aircraft. Mr. Kunze noted that a large revenue generator is liquor sales, and that if there were no sit down areas, there would be no liquor sales.

Commissioner Clever stated that TSA was to give guidelines as far as office space, which has not been provided and asked Mr. Grogan if he has that formula. Mr. Grogan stated that TSA has a national standard for personnel and administration space, however it is not available to consultants.

Commissioner Soccio asked what has been done at other airports to provide space for

TSA. Mr. Grogan stated that it is a constant struggle over how much and who pays for it. He stated that it is not a capacity driver of the Airport; it is simply a convenience for the

employees. Commissioner Soccio asked if a smaller number could be used as a placeholder for the EIR. Mr. Grogan stated that it could.

Commissioner Clever asked about the ticket counter space, noting that many airlines are converting to ticketing computers, and asked how that would relate to the space calculations. Mr. Grogan stated that the kiosks are now being used and that he does not see a significant change in the future.

Commissioner Soccio asked at what point would the phased facilities for the commuter flights be constructed. Mr. Kunze stated that in the “guiding principles”, one of the suggestions was that the City Council requests that the Commission work with staff to develop a phasing plan.

Commissioner Veady asked if there could be a postponement of the commuter terminal area development, and if the number of aircraft parking positions would be maintained for the airline portion. Mr. Kunze stated that that would be part of the design process, and for an efficient operation, the parking positions should be sized to accommodate the largest typical aircraft, however, it could be designed for smaller aircraft but in doing so, there would be a loss of flexibility.

Commissioner Clever noted that ticket counters at some airports are multi-user counters, where no one airline is assigned counter space, so that all peak hour users can have access. Mr. Kunze stated that the airlines do that now by default. He stated that, for example, the north holdroom is outfitted to operate JetBlue flights if necessary, and that all airlines are on 30-day notice, and that the airlines are to work together to allocate space.

Commissioner Clever asked if there is remote parking for aircraft. Mr. Kunze stated that there are parking positions identified on Runway 34R/16L. He stated that parking position is not an operational pad, but simply a location to park while waiting for an opening on the airline ramp.

Commissioner Temple asked about baggage screening and TSA requirements, and asked if that square footage was provided. Mr. Grogan stated that HNTB has the standard required for baggage screening.

Commissioner Soccio asked if a proposed second story for office is included in the square footage numbers. Mr. Kunze stated in the guiding principles, there are no provisions for a second story on the holdrooms. However, if there could be a second story in another area, over the baggage claim for example, or in a place that could not be converted for use as holdroom capacity, that it would make sense to explore that in the design process.

Commissioner Luskin stated that land is a valuable commodity, and that a second story is better than encroaching on more land, and that it would be foolish financially not to look at a second story scenario.

Mr. Grogan stated that for vehicular parking a downsized option is not recommended for the reason that parking demand can and will be met off-Airport, if inadequate capacity is

provided on-Airport. He stated that it makes sense that the Airport would want that revenue.

Chairman Fox asked about presentational format. Mr. Grogan stated that the report would include narrative with analysis and the impacts, with a plan layout so there would be a visible graphic representation. Chairman Fox asked when the alternatives would be available for review. Mr. Kunze stated that the final documents should be in hand and available for mailing to Commissioners a week in advance of the September 16th meeting. He stated that if there are any suggestions or recommendations to staff in terms of different ways the presentation should go, to let staff know. Chairman Fox stated that the staff recommendations given at the July 15th meeting were excellent and understandable, and should be combined with the guiding principles given at the June 17th meeting. He stated that if the Commission were to know in advance how they are being asked to vote, it would be helpful. Mr. Kunze stated that if the Chair receives input, that guidance would be helpful in structuring the presentation.

Commissioner Temple expressed concerns about the voting process, and that he had a copy of the motion from the City Council, which reads... “request Airport Advisory Commission to address the issues surrounding the permanent construction project proposed at the Long Beach Airport and its Environmental Impact Report by any means necessary”. He stated that the Commission should be sure they are doing what they have been asked to do and nothing more. Mr. Kunze stated that the City Council direction is broad and generic and that his understanding of what the City Council is asking for is that they are asking for the Airport Advisory Commissions recommendation on the sizing of the proposed project, which is any new construction of terminal facilities for the purposes of doing the EIR. Also, for the EIR, they are asking for the Airport Advisory Commission’s recommendations on what should be in that EIR in terms of analysis and studies.

Chairman Fox asked if it would be anticipated that at the next meeting, the Commission should take an action on the proposed project sizing, but with only questions and deliberations regarding recommendations to the EIR with no vote on the EIR. Mr. Kunze stated that it would be favored to also get a recommendation on the EIR as well, and would like it to be on the agenda to allow that to happen.

Commissioner Clever suggested that three models be presented for the Commission to vote on. 1) what was proposed as the staff recommended option, 2) a scaled down alternative, and 3) an absolute minimum.

Commissioner Luskin asked that a visual be provided of what and where the improvements are to be constructed.

Douglas Park Boeing Realty Development Proposal

Chairman Fox stated that from his perspective, Boeing has done their best to accommodate requests made by the Commission. He asked if Boeing has any last comments to the Commission before they proceeded with a motion.

Mr. Jon Conk from Boeing Realty stated that Boeing has answered all concerns and have put to rest issues brought up by a letter sent from AOPA. He stated that he and DeDe Soto have made contact with each Commissioner to offer an opportunity to meet and

discuss the project and answer any further questions. He stated there were some issues, one being the aviation related uses proposed as part of the project, that are included within the EIR and in the proposed zoning. He stated that the acreage that could be devoted to aviation uses is south of Conant Street and is the stretch along the southern

part of the Boeing property, adjacent to Airport boundary, part of which is within the Boeing enclave for the B-717 and C-17 programs. He stated that 25 acres, not within that enclave, could be available immediately for aviation related uses to be developed as part of the project. He stated that within the Boeing enclave, there is an additional 11 acres for a total of 36 acres within the City of Long Beach boundaries that could be developed as aviation related uses. He stated that the acreage could be used for a variety of uses beside aviation related uses, such as office, R&D, or light industrial. He stated that another site consisting of 22 acres that could be considered for aviation related uses is within the City of Lakewood.

Commissioner Luskin asked what would be a non-through the fence aviation related use. Mr. Conk stated that it could be aviation businesses that do not have a need for direct airport access. Mr. Kunze stated that an example would be aircraft parts or avionics, where they did not need field access.

Chairman Fox stated that he believes that the Commission should be voting on the action, and asked the Commission for their comments.

Commissioner Luskin referred to a map that Boeing showed as ramp area, and asked if that ramp area would be for tie downs, hangars, or some other uses. Mr. Conk stated that Commissioner Luskin is referring to a document provided by the Long Beach Airport Association, and that it refers to the 25 acre piece that is south of Conant and immediately available for aviation related uses. He stated that it shows a number of hangar buildings, with tie down space in the middle. He stated that Boeing reviewed the proposal, and there are areas of concern regarding the runway protection zone and building restriction area which is shown on the Airport Layout Plan. He stated that the goal of the City of Long Beach is to produce high-income jobs on the site.

Chairman Fox stated that jobs and revenue generation capacity of the project is outside the purview of the Airport Advisory Commission. He stated that the Commission is looking at land use, airport compatibility and environmental and safety issues.

Chairman Fox asked if there is one specific proposal in front of the Commission at this time. Ms. Amy Bodek from Community Development stated that the proposal is as follows:

- A mixed use project that includes a maximum of 1,400 residential units
- Approximately 13 acres of open space, in the form of parks, bike paths, etc.
- 3.3 million square feet of commercial uses, within that, is the zone that would allow for aviation related uses.

Commissioner Luskin asked that the Commission vote on the Boeing proposal.

Chairman Fox stated that there are members of the public that have requested to speak

and that he would like to take final comments before a vote is taken.

Mr. Tim Mace distributed a statement and stated that his concern is residential encroachment, in addition to safety, noise, health effects, and traffic.

Mr. Kevin McAchren stated that the LBAA stands opposed to the residential component to the Boeing project.

Ms. Candy Robinson, Long Beach Flying Club, stated that in protecting the airport, there are zones designed for airplanes to get to the airport and not designed to build up to and protect the homeowners under the path. She stated that the DEIR should deal with State of California's recent guidelines to make sure that the guidelines in effect are being taken into account. She stated that it should also be considered that helicopter patterns are at 500 feet over the proposed homes.

Ms. Phyllis Ortman, President of Lakewood Village Neighborhood Association, stated that their concern is safety and pollution in the parks proposed in the project, and concerned for children that may be subjected to safety issues and pollution. She stated that she is not a lone voice that she is speaking for 5,000 in the association.

Chairman Fox asked for comments from Commissioner Luskin.

Commissioner Luskin stated that the Commission should vote on the Boeing proposal. He stated that the Commissioners could submit their individual recommendations to the City Council or send a recommendation as one body, and asked for discussion.

Chairman Fox stated that he would like to see a recommendation as one body.

Commissioner Luskin moved that the Commission vote on the Boeing proposal.

Commissioner Soccio stated that she believes the proposal as she understands it is 1,400 residential, 400 of which are apartments, 3.3 million square feet of commercial, to include light industrial, R&D, and office, and 200,000 square feet of retail.

Comments were taken from the audience, Mr. Ken Malone, and Mr. Reed.

Commissioner Luskin asked for a two part vote, one for the Boeing project without the residential component, and the second for the project as proposed with the residential included.

Commissioner Temple stated there are other items to vote on as follows:

1. approve the Douglas Park concept as currently proposed
2. approve the Douglas Park concept as currently proposed, without the residential component, or
3. with a residential component with less than 1,400 units.
4. that the 31 acres have first option for aviation related uses

Mr. Conk from Boeing Realty stated that the 2002 CalTrans handbook was used in the preparation of the EIR.

Commissioner Haubert stated that it would be important to not only take a vote up or down but to include the why explanation to the City Council.

Chairman Fox moved that the Commission approve the Douglas Park project as proposed. Commissioner Luskin seconded the motion. A vote was taken and did not pass.

Commissioner Haubert moved to recommend approval of the project but modified to include a housing element of less than 1,400 units, and to propose that there is a higher percentage of owner occupied, and a higher percentage of single family detached housing. Commissioner Clever seconded the motion.

Commissioner Veady stated that the housing figure could then be 1,399 and she would have a hard time voting for that project. A vote was taken and did not pass.

Commissioner Luskin stated that if Boeing were to come back with another scenario, that it should be something other than a residential component. He stated that the residential component jeopardizes the use of Runway 16R, and that he is in opposition to any residential.

Chairman Fox moved that the Commission approve the Douglas Park project as proposed subject to having no residential component and including the cautions and warnings contained in Airport Staff 's May 25th written recommendations on the EIR. Commissioner Luskin seconded the motion.

Commissioner Haubert stated that he understands that the vote is against any residential and he opposes that concept because residential makes the project work to some extent.

Commissioner Temple would like to see the inclusion of the 31 acres as a first option for aviation related uses.

Chairman Fox made a substitute motion, recommending that Commission approve the Douglas Park project as proposed subject to having no residential component and including the cautions and warnings contained in Airport Staff's May 25th written recommendations on the EIR and see the inclusion of the 31 acres as a first option for aviation related uses. Commissioner Luskin seconded the motion.

The vote passed with a 4/3 as follows:

Commissioner Haubert – No

Commissioner Luskin – Yes

Commissioner Clever – No

Commissioner Temple – Yes

Chairman Fox –Yes

Commissioner Soccio -No

Commissioner Veady -Yes

Chairman Fox stated that the actual language of the recommendation will be reviewed.

Commissioner Haubert moved that the Chairman convey the vote by the Airport Advisory Commission to the City Council with a courtesy copy to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Temple seconded the motion.

The vote passed unanimously.

Commissioners Comments

None

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Dottie Jones, Airport Secretary
Long Beach Airport

Approved